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Exploring the Unincorporated Status of Pajaro, CA
By: Ernesto Sánchez

I. Introduction:

The purpose of this paper is to explore the complex interwoven political, social, and economic factors that shape unincorporated communities; particularly the rural community of Pajaro, California. Due to the absence of municipal autonomy (city status), which provides higher levels of self-determination, unincorporated communities experience a unique political climate that limits Pajaro’s ability to exercise self-sustainability and citizenship participation. This paper, written from the experience of a low-income, Chicano male, who lived in Pajaro for two years, strives to invite the reader towards realizing that Monterey County’s well-being depends on the support, recognition, and political participation of unincorporated communities; the majority of them serving as Monterey County’s agricultural labor force.

I contend that failure to protect the interests of small rural communities such as Pajaro, validates the widening gap between underserved and overserved areas in Monterey County and the acceptance of unsuitable living standards. Not only does this paper strive to raise awareness on power imbalances within certain county areas, but also offers a few suggestions on ways to improve inter-communication barriers faced within unincorporated communities.

Two basic questions arose as I began my research. First, if unincorporation is the political category describing communities governed by County Board of Supervisors, what are alternatives to unincorporation and how would such changes in political status alter the economic, cultural, and social environment of unincorporated spaces? Second, is unincorporation the primary barrier preventing Pajaro’s achievement for greater recognition, self-sufficiency, and health? Both questions are difficult to answer and stress the need to
pursuit public dialogue regarding deprioritized areas of Monterey County. The initiation of community dialogue regarding the status of unincorporated communities starts by distinguishing three alternatives: annexation, incorporation, or the realignment of district boundaries, options that would drastically shape unincorporated communities of Monterey County. It must also be mentioned that exploring the needs of Pajaro residents would be virtually non-existent if it were not for a major flood disaster that took place in 1995.

Unincorporated communities in Monterey County are the labor camps for the 21st century agricultural industry. As this paper will hopefully show, state policy, capitalist structures, racism, sexism, classism, and a variety of mechanisms are utilized by the White middle and upper class elite to secure agricultural interests at the expense of unincorporated communities that are prevented from social mobilization. Along with the effects from a prioritized agricultural industry in Monterey County, city governments surrounding unincorporated communities invade such areas in their quest for development and tax revenue.
II. 1995 Pajaro Flood

In 1993, the Monterey County Zone 7 flood district, which includes Pajaro, was formed in order to maintain the Pajaro River beginning from San Benito County. During that time, an environmental impact study was needed to investigate the clearing of debris of the Pajaro River which required an approximated $380,000. The main purpose of the environmental impact study was to protect the endangered Santa Cruz long-toed salamander. Zone 7 paralleled both the city of Watsonville and the unincorporated area of Pajaro. As state bureaucracy postponed the Army Corps of Engineers from clearing the sand bags developing at the bottom of the Pajaro River along the 5-mile span of Zone 7, fundraising did not suffice the costs for the environmental impact study.

On March 10, 1995, Watsonville Police and emergency workers evacuated over 2,000 residents from Pajaro and Watsonville Bay Village retirement complexes within 24 hours. Later that night, the Pajaro River overflowed, forcing over 3,000 Pajaro residents into homelessness. All evacuees were relocated to the Watsonville Fairgrounds, Watsonville High School, The Salvation Army, and the Veteran’s Memorial Hall. The flood devastated both the residents of Pajaro and agricultural businesses of the Pajaro area. Over 3,000 acres of Pajaro farmland were damaged, “each damaged acre of strawberry representing $13,000 of pre-production revenue and close to $17,000 in lost wages for workers, said Mike Jani, president of the Farm Bureau” (Raider). At least 1,000 acres were planted with strawberries in the North Monterey County area.
The following week, public officials estimated that clean-up cost would range in the millions of dollars. Several major highways were closed for days as working crews tried to drain the floodwaters of Pajaro. Adding to the loss of funds, farmers of the Pajaro Valley area who were affected by the floods lost over a “$500 million annual harvest” (Raider). Equally devastating was the fact that about 1,500 jobs for farmworkers were lost during the floods, the majority of them occupied by farmworkers living in the unincorporated community of Pajaro.

On March 14, 1995, four days after the flood, Pajaro residents were allowed to check their businesses and residencies, only to find devastating results. Only a limited number of people were allowed to enter Pajaro after realizing that raw sewage spilled into the flood waters, threatening the health of Pajaro residents who came in contact with the contaminated water. In addition to dangerously high concentrations of contaminants in the flood water, there were reasonable suspicions to believe that pesticides seeped into the flooded area.

The day following the flood, White House Chief of Staff, and former Congressman of Monterey, Leon Panetta visited the flood-damaged Pajaro area. Congressman Sam Farr and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) chief administrators examined the area as a first attempt to evaluate and distribute flood relief programs.

The Pajaro River levee was built in 1947 and was designed to withstand 19,000 cubic feet of water per second. According to Army Corps of Engineers Lt. Col. Michael Walsh, “On Saturday, water flows reached 22,500 cubic feet per second” (Brinson). It was obvious that the Pajaro levee was incapable
handling heavy storms due to the unpredictable “25-year floods.” This did not include the fact that development in the southern portion of Santa Clara county has increased river flow.

On March 17, 1995, Watsonville City Councilman Dennis Osmer publicly stated that he was going to bring up the issue of annexing Pajaro at the city council meeting (Alvarado). According to Osmer, “We are the same community.” Even though the Pajaro floods clearly proved that Pajaro received second priority during the outbreak of a disaster in Monterey County, Watsonville quickly reacted to the situation and was capable of handling the basic needs of Pajaro residents. It seemed that the fate of Pajaro would surely change for the best if annexation was initiated.

At the time, the predominantly Spanish speaking Mexican immigrant community of Pajaro supported annexation as it was evident that Pajaro residents were left to wait until Monterey County officials provided immediate flood relief to other parts of the county that were either:

- Incorporated areas.
- Were closer to the centralized location of Monterey County.
- Comprised a higher proportion of Anglo-American residents who were more capable to reach their public representatives.

However, no state legislature existed at the time, and fails to exist, that allowed cross-county annexations. The only way to successfully implement the annexation of Pajaro by Watsonville was to create a legislative law approved by the California House Assembly and approved by the governor of California. As a general proposition, states have broad discretion to create, expand, contract, or even destroy their subdivisions (Berri, p. 237). The geographic boundary between Watsonville and Pajaro would also make it difficult to change California state laws because 10 other cities in the state also exchanged geographic boundaries. Unfortunately, the attempt to annex Pajaro into Watsonville was defeated by a vote of 4-3 at the Watsonville city council meeting. In retrospect, there were several major planning flaws that led to the defeat of Watsonville’s plan to annex Pajaro:

- Pajaro residents were not asked in a formal matter whether they preferred annexation.
• Watsonville city government did not coordinate discussions regarding annexation with Monterey County government officials.
• Only two representatives from Pajaro attended the city council meeting.
• It is difficult to annex by ordinance because county and property owners can deny annexation.
• An annexing city must be prepared to provide a plan of services (Growth).

At the time, Watsonville Mayor Tony Ramos was also skeptical about annexing Pajaro. According to Ramos, “We have 22 percent unemployment in the city of Watsonville. I don’t know if you want to be part of that” (Alvarado). What Mayor Ramos failed to account was the fact that Pajaro residents were only temporarily out of work. It was also highly possible that Monterey County felt that annexation of Pajaro would create negative strategic effects on a political, social, and economic scale. As Berri notes, “A change in the size, shape, or nature of a municipal corporation alters the relative voting strength of groups within and outside of the corporate limits. For example, a city can dilute the voting strength of a minority racial or ethnic group by annexing an all-white territory” (Berri p.237). In this case, Monterey County would be severely impacted if Watsonville, thus Santa Cruz County, gained authority across the geographic boundary of the Pajaro River. Such a trend by Watsonville would surely lead to continual annexations of Monterey County land due to factors such as lower tax bases offered by Santa Cruz County agricultural interests.
III. Incorporation and Unincorporation of Pajaro

According to Coping with Growth in Unincorporated Areas, a report conducted by the Division of Environmental Studies at the University of Texas at San Antonio, “Annexation is defined as a process of expanding corporate city boundaries such that municipal services are provided and city government authorizes available properties and persons of the area as may be necessary” (Coping, p. 92). The proximity between Pajaro and the neighboring city of Watsonville is the most influential reason why annexation is a viable option. The considerably large city of Watsonville provides Pajaro residents convenient access to shopping centers, health services, and recreational opportunities. However, the latter part of this paper will explain a more accurate description of Pajaro residents’ attempt to receive services in Watsonville. According to Cornelia Butler Flora in her book, Rural Communities: Legacy and Change, "Labor Market Areas” (LMA’s) include both the residential and work destinations of local people. These areas are multi-county regions that encompass those places where relatively large numbers of people routinely move back and forth from home to work.” Pajaro community residents fall under the LMA distinction due to their inter-county travel between their homes in Monterey County and services in the Santa Cruz County.

The Pajaro community is isolated exclusively within agricultural land on all sides of its borders except the north border, which parallels the Pajaro River. On the southern-most portion of Salinas Road, which intersects Highway 1, one notices that Pajaro's southern boundary is determined by railroad tracks and a sufficiently large accumulation of cargo trains. According to Butler-Flora, "In the early days of railroading, communities tended to appear where railroad lines were planned” (Butler Flora, p. 20). Directly across the tracks, agricultural fields and farming supply establishments dominate the landscape.

As a way to protect the surrounding agricultural lands of Pajaro, the federal government approved the 1996 Williamson Act, an act intended to preserve agricultural land and open space by discouraging their premature and unnecessary conversion to urban
lands. Of the 724,119 total acres of unincorporated land preserved in Monterey County, 95% of them are zoned as open space” (Tellus, p. 18). Protecting agricultural interests sustains the leading industry for Monterey County at the expense of rural communities needing of developments such as affordable housing, recreational space, and human service facilities requiring land space currently protected by state zoning regulations.

The ambiguity of the Williamson Act stems from its lack of specificity over the meaning of “unnecessary conversions” of land. In the past, unnecessary conversions of land were characterized as sprawl. According to James J. Reilly’s report, A Proposal for a Flexible Overlay Zoning District to Govern Certain Urban Unincorporated Territories Within Santa Clara County, “Physically, sprawl can be seen in fringe areas where farmland predominates, but residential subdivisions are scattered at random within the rural setting” (Reilly, p. 10). In this case, the underrepresented Pajaro community competes with incorporated cities and other semi-developed communities in an effort to collect from the limited resources and budgets Monterey County imposes on unincorporated areas aside from competing for recognition and participation in county-wide politics.

Zoning regulations, therefore, are intended to prevent developments that would produce lower profits in comparison to the per-acre revenue collected for agricultural interests. According to the Coping with Growth in Unincorporated Areas report, “Zoning is the regulation of building types, densities, and uses permitted in districts established [and protected] by law” (Coping, p. 61). Due to its unincorporated status, Pajaro experiences zoning regulations established by the Land Area Formation Commission (LAFCO), a state funded agency whose director is elected by the state congressman.

The second political alternative for the Pajaro community is incorporation. Municipal governments (city governments), unlike unincorporated communities, hold a higher level of autonomy over the designation of land use. According to the Coping with Growth in Unincorporated Areas report, “Cities have the power to zone and plan for urban growth for the betterment of the community and control subdivisions within their limits” (Coping, p. 88). Therefore, one positive aspect of possessing city status is greater decision-making power regarding future land use through the implementation of a City General plan.

The California State legislature possesses the highest level of authority over the implementation of Pajaro as a city; municipal governments oversee that State legislation is met within its regional boundaries. As Berri describes, “Because cities are merely convenient entities to which state delegates authorize, the court reasoned, a state may constitutionally, expand, contract, create, and even destroy its municipal corporations (Berri, p. 240). Even though the state government has ultimate authority over validating the
potential of Pajaro’s incorporation into Monterey County, countywide support must be established prior to such a proposal.

Besides state approval and community support for potential incorporations of rural communities, other requirements for the formation of a city are currently in place that discourages such political actions. According to the Growth Policy, Annexation, and Incorporation Under Public Policy Act 1101 of 1998 Report, “A new city must enact a property tax that raises revenue at least equal to the annual amount the city receives for state shared taxes” (Growth, p. 4). The report goes on to state that newly formed cities must provide civic services no longer funded by the county such as water, electrical, sanitary and sewer services, road construction and repair, recreational facilities and programs, street lighting, zoning services, public safety, fire department, and city hall facilities (Growth). Public Policy Act 1101 of 1998 also states that “A city many not use its zoning power to interfere with land used for agricultural purposes” (Growth, p. 5). As mentioned previously, land designated as agricultural surrounds the entire Pajaro community at this point.

Even if Pajaro were to receive city status, state laws would prevent its development into agricultural fields and areas designated as open space. Pajaro would encounter difficult issues in terms of locating areas allowed by the county for housing and commercial growth. State law also requires the establishment of a joint economic and community development board capable of engaging communications at all sectors of the Pajaro community if it were to receive city status. Such requirements make it evident that development of a city begins several years prior to any official proposal for incorporation; developments that occur through financial investing and land availability designated to the unincorporated community on a continual basis.

From an administrative perspective, advocates for new city developments must, “Determine and report the costs and projected costs of core infrastructure, urban services, and public facilities necessary to fully develop the resources within the city’s current boundaries” (Growth, p. 9). The implementation of administrative budgets and forecasted city expenditures require substantial amounts of revenue. As an effort towards lowering city development budget figures, several issues can be explored, such as understanding whether Pajaro currently possesses urban services and public facilities capable of meeting state requirements.

On a regional level, Monterey County is composed of 5 districts. Pajaro, like the majority of other unincorporated communities, is located within the largest district of the county; District 3. Since the majority of residents in unincorporated communities of District 3 do not possess United States citizenship, farm owners living in isolated
neighborhoods around the district comprise most of the voting pool. According to Manning Marable’s essay, “Building Coalitions among Communities of Color: Beyond Racial Identity Politics,” “Over one-third of the Latino population of more than 24 million in the United States consists of undocumented workers” (Jennings, p. 37). Manning continues by revealing that by 1990, about one out of nine U.S. households spoke a non-English language at home, predominantly Spanish. It is important to note that Pajaro's virtually non-existent number of qualified voters stalls its political decision-making power and representation within the Monterey County.

Not only do Pajaro residents face voting obstacles, they are also limited to participation in governmental affairs by a variety of barriers. It is difficult for a migrant farmworker to attend district meetings usually held at inconvenient times. Lacking time and energy, farmworkers are filtered out of political participation. As Berri states, “In such cases, the party challenging the state’s action bears the heavy burden of proving both a discriminatory effect on voting rights and a discriminatory intent on the part of the legislative body responsible for the structure (Berri p. 238). Proving that unjust barriers are placed on the voting potential of Pajaro residents would be difficult, which explains why the Latino vote of Pajaro residents remains uncounted.

The Mexican-descendant characteristic of Pajaro is common among unincorporated farm labor communities in California. According to the 1997 Pajaro Model Partnership: Community Plan, “Over 85% of Pajaro residents are of Mexican descent. Family sizes average 4.6 people and 59% of the population is under 30 years old (Tellus). This statistic does not mention the high probability that households often house two or three families due to lack of affordable housing. Of those over persons 18 years of age in Pajaro, 54% have less than a ninth grade education” (Pajaro, p. 10). The majority of Pajaro residents work in the surrounding agricultural fields, a Monterey County industry that has produced an estimated $3 billion dollars in a single year (Tellus, p. 4). The Pajaro community has also witnessed a dramatic growth in population size from previous decades. During the 1980’s, the Latino population in Monterey County increased by 59.1%, more than twice the rate of the population as a whole” (Tellus, p. 2). Reflecting
the intense influx of Latino residents in Monterey County, Pajaro was made up of over 3,000 residents by 1990.

By 1997, Pajaro’s population size increased to 3,500-4,000 (Pajaro). Revealing precise population size estimates of a given rural community is important, especially for rural Latino communities of California that face higher levels of poverty, lack of political representation, and social services. According to Butler Flora, "Government organizations create definitions to define those who should be served by a particular program, to identify those who should be exempt from a specific policy, to make their jobs more manageable, or to target resources" (Butler Flora, p. 7). Federal and state government utilize census figures and other statistical methods to decide whether certain cities or unincorporated communities will be given the opportunity to expand based on forecasted economic estimates of a given area.

As previously stated, the proximity of available services forces Pajaro residents into the Santa Cruz County. If Pajaro residents choose to receive services within the Monterey County, they must travel about 8 miles into the neighboring town of Castroville. It is not convenient for Pajaro residents to travel into the Monterey County for attainment of services. The limited option of services targeted for Pajaro residents within the northern portion of Monterey County completely halts the growth of that area by transferring sales tax revenues outside the community, in this case the city of Watsonville. Sales tax revenue from purchased goods and services outside the Monterey County is not capable of being reinvested within the unincorporated community of Pajaro.

Analyzing the status of Pajaro from a county-wide perspective uncovers many levels of similarity to other unincorporated communities and the influence they have within the Monterey County. According to the Tellus Report, “Approximately 28% of the population in Monterey County lives in unincorporated areas” (Tellus, p. 2). In 1990, 30% of 400,000 Monterey County residents were of Latino origin. Five years later, the per capita income of Latino residents in Monterey County was $8,000 compared to the per capita income of Anglo residents of Monterey County of $18,000 (Tellus, p. 4). These figures reflect Pajaro resident’s exploited financial status and their subservient role towards sustaining the county’s billion dollar agricultural industry; 24% of all jobs in Monterey County are agriculturally-based (Tellus, p. 27).

In terms of the distribution of funds towards redevelopment and/or beautification of areas, all Monterey County unincorporated communities only received $9 million from the Transient Occupancy Tax collected from Tourism in 1994 compared to the $7 million that the city of Monterey received (Tellus). In sum, the tourist industry depends on the restoration of well preserved locations of Monterey County, which deprioritizes an equal
amount of reinvestment in unincorporated communities. Not having a city council affects Pajaro by denying it an annual city budget and the power to alter its commercial potential. At this point, all such decisions fall under the authority of the District Three County Supervisor and other agencies with high levels of decision-making ability.
IV. What is Urban Sprawl?: A Brief Description

According to the California Futures Organization, “Agriculture is California’s number one industry, employing over 500,000 people and generating as much as 25.6 billion in sales (Calfutures). While community development opportunities for low-income residents are considered urban sprawl, suburban development, which is not a new phenomenon in California, receives little to no stigmatization for its low-density development. According to Jennifer Dickman in her thesis, “The effects of urban sprawl on the agriculture industry: A Case Study on the Central Valley of California, “The problem is that cities have overdeveloped with the goal of increasing their tax base. We have used prime agriculture land to achieve this goal and now California’s farmer’s are feeling the effects” (Dickman, p. 5). Agricultural interests are currently battling for revenue through the preservation of open space. On the other hand, city governments must depend on sales and property tax as revenue to comply with state-mandates. As a result, underdeveloped communities such as Pajaro and the majority of unincorporated communities are transformed as economic commodities; either benefiting the agricultural industry through the maintenance of a dependent subjugated workforce having their communities destroyed by commercial development that drastically affects low-income families.

According to the Planner’s guide to Sprawl on the Internet:
Banks gave more loans to people of higher economic status, usually those building outside of the city. The more money a family had the further away from the noise and pollution of the city. So the money left the city and was put into areas adjacent to the city for the convenience of the ‘suburbanites’. The banks were now ‘redlining’ districts in which no home loans would be given, almost all of which were in the inner city. The Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 said that banks must have a certain percentage of their loans going to people within the community in which the branch is located (Planner’s).

Lack of capital investment in unincorporated communities from banking institutions and other funding sources prevents the upward mobility of Pajaro residents. On the other hand, Pajaro is slowly being influenced by Silicon Valley growth downstream into North Monterey County region. Such an impact could create a situation where property owners sell their property for middle-class housing developments, placing a large threat to low-income families who can’t represent themselves during decision-making processes.

According to Dickman, in the “1990 census, 80% of all Californians live in metropolitan areas of 1 million or more. This is referred to as the ‘urbanization of California.’ The metropolitan areas become an intense competition for places to live and
work. At the same time, the edges of the metropolitan areas continue to grow to accommodate the increase of economic activity and population growth. The inner cities are left to decay because the money leaves the urban core and heads to the suburbs” (Dickman, p. 11). The city of Watsonville’s inclusion of Pajaro territory for the completion of the Future’s Study of potential growth areas clearly inventoried the small community of Pajaro as a site. The inclusion of Pajaro within city planning documents only reaffirms that growth influences the Pajaro regions from two fronts: Watsonville and Santa Clara.

Dickman goes on to state a very important fact regarding the constant struggle between city interests versus agricultural interests. She states, “The suburban development puts a lot of pressure on municipalities to provide service delivery and the appropriate infrastructure to these new communities. Some cities have put an end to this by claiming a “no growth” policy. They set urban boundary lines and deny any request for development outside these areas. Then one can see the other side of the spectrum, the town that needs revenue so badly, it will do anything to attract growth. Some cities, like many in the Central Valley are so desperate for revenue that growth is going on completely unchecked” (Dickman, pp. 11-12). This scenario will be the case when the federal government is unable to subsidize farmers as a preventive measure against the selling of property to real estate developers. Not only do farmowners profit from owning land, grow produce, receive subsidies from the government, lease their land, benefit from legalized use of pesticides and fertilizers, but also benefit surplus labor, maintain ownership of property and have the option to sell their land to developers or expanding cities where political power is centered (historically benefiting White upper-class males).

Migrant farmworkers and low-income residents of Monterey County receive the brunt of any type of economic shift in power since it is their subjugated labor force that will sustain either industry. While landowners gain thousands in profits for selling their property to developers, unincorporated communities become drastically affected through loss of already meager jobs, risk of community deterioration, and potential evictions.

I agree with Dickman when she states that, “Turning down all development in order to avoid annexation of land will eventually catch up in revenue loss (unless the community is highly prestigious already and receives revenue from tourism)” (Dickman, p. 12). Political representatives of upper-class Monterey residents understand the importance of tourism as a safeguard to revenue loss and increased leverage against the need to annex land for economic necessity. The city of Monterey disproportionately invests in its own tourist industry while showing its lack of urgency for other communities, predominantly farmworking and Mexican-immigrant communities. While the richer cities get richer in Monterey County, the poor unincorporated communities get poorer until a disaster occurs,
thus forcing public officials to respond. This reactionary stance on providing for Pajaro’s needs has occurred several times; all one needs to do is research the events that resulted in the 1995 floods and other community incidents.

As Dickman points out, a 1995 study conducted by the University of California’s Agricultural Issues Center discovered that the average age of a California farmer is 50 years old. Recognizing the average age of a typical farm owner in California is important since it allows for the assumption that retirement and the collection of cash assets will only add more reasons to sell their property to developers and/or mass agriculturists who can afford the purchase of large parcels of land.

In closing of this section, Dickman states, “Citizens need to know that the land use decisions that they’re planning commissioner’s and city councilmen and women are making directly affect the economy. The availability and affordability of housing can be directly linked to land use decisions. Land use decisions also have an impact on the quality of life, in turn quality of life has a major impact on business location decisions” (Dickman, pp. 26-27). I must agree with this comment in that communities that have been limited, discouraged, or even denied citizenship participation are vulnerable to agricultural and business interests.
V. Interview with Jim Colangelo, Director of the Monterey County Land Area Formation Commission (LAFCO)

On October of 1999, I had the opportunity to interview Jim Colangelo, Director of the Monterey County Land Area Formation Commission (LAFCO). Jim Colangelo and I discussed the influence of LAFCO on unincorporated areas. According to Colangelo, LAFCO has no direct control over land use, the commission only responds to the fulfillment of the Monterey County General Plan created by the board of supervisors. Based on the general plan, LAFCO would create agencies, or contract with existing agencies that provide the same service, in order to comply with the general plan’s vision of development for communities in a cost-efficient manner.

According to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), the commission was created at the end of World War II due to a tremendous increase in population size that resulted in the creation of sprawled communities centered on industrial employment. The objectives of LAFCO are to “Encourage the orderly formation of local government agencies” (LAFCO Brochure). LAFCO also reviews proposals for the formation of governmental agencies. There are 57 LAFCO commissions in the state of California working for 57 counties, 500 or so cities, and an estimated 3,000 special districts. Another role that LAFCO plays is the ability to shape boundaries and thus shape the amount of taxes that residents in those boundaries pay for services. According to the LAFCO brochure, “LAFCO must consider the effect that any proposal will produce on existing agricultural lands.” Therefore, the strategy used by LAFCO, thus agricultural interests, is to guide development of urban spaces while maintaining agricultural preserves.

According to LAFCO, “Urban Sprawl can best be described as irregular and disorganized growth occurring without apparent design or plan.” In addition, sprawl is categorized by the lack of delivery for urban services such as police, fire, water, and sanitation and the unnecessary loss of agricultural land. By controlling sprawl, LAFCO “limits the misuse of land resources and promotes a more efficient system of local...
governmental agencies.” The preceding statement is charged with undefined meanings and unresolved questions as to why communities with a lack of services immediately become labeled as disorganized and/or irregular.

It is ironic that it took a major environmental disaster to raise the county’s awareness of Pajaro community needs for support and services. Secondly, the use of the term “urban” by agencies such as LAFCO to define the growth of unincorporated areas confuses county residents to the fact that a community officially recognized as urban must be composed of at least 30,000 residents. Clearly, any development of resources and services in Pajaro, a community that totals a population size of at least 4,000 due to seasonal work, should not be considered “urban growth.” Stigmatizing the development of rural unincorporated communities as uncontrollable, unnecessary, and/or urban, allow county public officials and county residents from avoiding spending revenue to implement basic civic and human services within those communities.

It is interesting to note that individuals have the power to propose boundary changes. LAFCO agencies do not have the power to initiate boundary changes on their own, “except for proposals involving the dissolution or consolidation of special districts and the merging of subsidiary districts” (LAFCO Brochure). In order for community residents to practice their rights as molders of community, information regarding the definition of special districts and subsidiary districts must be understood at a community-wide level.

According to LAFCO material, one of the most important charges given LAFCO was the adoption of the “Sphere of Influence” for local governments in 1972. The Sphere of Influence is the physical boundary and service area that local government agencies are expected to serve. The Sphere of Influence is intended to discourage urban sprawl by preventing overlapping jurisdictions and services. When asked about the pro’s and con’s of Pajaro’s current unincorporated status, Colangelo stated that not having city status provides less state government interaction with unincorporated area residents. In other words, Pajaro and other unincorporated communities suffer by economic development interests and their access to such communities that lack lenient code enforcement and a higher acceptance rate of permits. The downside of Pajaro’s unincorporated status, according to Colangelo, is having one public official, Lou Calcagno, supervise District 3 which is the largest district in the county. Situated in this district, increases Pajaro’s lack of representation and slower responsiveness to community needs.

When asked about the pro’s and con’s of annexing Pajaro into Watsonville, Colangelo stated that Pajaro would benefit from annexation since it is already participating in shaping Watsonville’s economy. However, the downside of annexing Pajaro into
Watsonville would be the geographical boundary that separates Watsonville and Pajaro. According to Colangelo, “I don’t see it happening.” The Pajaro River would create two separate identities between Pajaro and Watsonville, running the potential of Pajaro not being effectively represented.” Colangelo’s forecast is possible, but it is not definite. Such a view of Pajaro/Watsonville relations is an assumption intended to discourage the political, social, and economic combination of both communities.

Soon after, our conversation moved towards discussion of Silicon Valley’s southward push for housing in North Monterey County. According to Colangelo, “North Monterey County will be seen as a bedroom community if we don’t do something about it.” When asked about the revision of the Monterey County 21st Century General Plan, Colangelo stated that the general plan is trying to be an all-inclusive process. According to Colangelo, “One needs to agree what the problems are in Pajaro based on a bottom’s up approach.” Colangelo also suggested that during a lack of consensus over problem awareness, “One must ignore people who are the most ardent opponents.” In addition, Colangelo stated that the majority of the county does not know what LAFCO does. Information must be distributed throughout the community to build stronger ties with small business.”

When asked what changes needed to be made in order to incorporate Pajaro as a city, Colangelo stated that other alternatives besides traditional revenue builders such as property and sales tax would have to be implemented. Colangelo agreed that affordable housing needs to be constructed in Pajaro for the residents of Pajaro. He also stated that Pajaro is a “prime area” due to its gateway location with the Watsonville/Santa Cruz County. Colangelo and I agreed that Pajaro fosters a sense of place and with appropriate planning, Pajaro would benefit by LAFCO’s ability to provide recreational, planning, and a whole range of other services. In order to accomplish goals of community empowerment, Colangelo stated that he avoids discussing the economic aspects of planning at the initial stages because it tends to lower expectations for successful planning.

When asked about Royal Oaks, a newly recognized community neighboring Pajaro, Colangelo stated that the recognition of Royal Oaks was intended to improve postal service and zip code efforts. Colangelo then stated that having the post office change or create a zip code for an area raises property values for housing situated within the new zip code boundary. There is the possibility that raising the property value of an area through the implementation of a new zip code, assuming that land prices increase when property is located within a certain boundary, creates profits for property owners; at the same time serving as a barrier against unwanted development. As for Pajaro, it continues to use Watsonville’ zip code and continues to experience unwanted development.
When asked about inter-governmental contracts, Colangelo stated that LAFCO “Is exempt from viewing inter-governmental contracts.” Only the agencies that are negotiating such contracts, most likely with the city of Watsonville, are required to view inter-governmental contract documents. According to Colangelo, the downside of inter-governmental contracts is the lack of control Pajaro residents might have over institutional decision-making.

After discussing the size of District 3, Colangelo agreed that it should be “Split in half.” Colangelo felt that Lou Calcagno, District 3 supervisor has done a good job and explained that District 3 was purposely intended to be a large area in order to create a “Hispanic District.” From my interpretation, creating a large district comprised mostly of unincorporated communities and Latinos, county government receives a larger portion of state revenue sharing support. However, it is evident that Latino communities within this district are not fully represented in politics, are not receiving an equal level of development as opposed to Monterey County tourist cities, and continues to experience prejudicial treatment. As Benmayor and Flores point out in their book, *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*, “Second-class citizenship is so pervasive in Latino communities that Latinos have accepted their treatment as inevitable” (Benmayor et al., p. 255). Even though county governments receive higher economic state support as a result of its preservation of unincorporated areas, that does not necessarily mean that such support is equally distributed to families and communities below the poverty level.

Finally, the interview ended with a discussion on Pajaro’s lack of services and a brief statement over the growth of Silicon Valley. First, Colangelo believed that Pajaro should receive concentrated development in a way that increases the quality of life for Pajaro residents. Since Pajaro is not a city, Colangelo suggested that commissions and extension organizations such as Together In Pajaro, a non-profit organization, would provide city
council type representation in order to raise community issues to the Board of Supervisors. According to Colangelo, “introducing services to Pajaro runs the risk that an equal amount growth of consumer businesses will be needed to alleviate costs.” I must add that such a forecast is based on the preservation of profit margins for the established structure. To state that an equal growth of consumer business is needed to alleviate service costs in the Pajaro community assumes that service costs are equal to profit gains for businesses. Also, such a statement implies that business interests should not be responsible for the economic costs of providing services for Pajaro residents. Instead, Pajaro residents must bear the burden of receiving their right to services by allowing an increase of business interests to enter the community. Most likely, such business interests intend to profit from the Pajaro community labor force.

Empty lot located on Railroad Ave. in Pajaro

At the end of the interview, Colangelo raised the issue of Silicon Valley by stating that, “We can’t stop them from coming here, but we can develop what communities they buy into.” This statement reinforces the current developmental trend of the Pajaro community based on the construction of processing plants and other business sectors that exploit the working class by maintaining cheap wages and seasonal employment. If they, meaning Santa Clara business interests and middle class home seekers, are coming to Pajaro and we, meaning LAFCO and the County Board of Supervisors, have accepted Santa Clara’s steady influx, the Pajaro community is being developed in a way that keeps outside forces on the margins by maintaining conditions unsuitable and unacceptable for people above the poverty level.
VI. Interview with Lou Calcagno, District Three Monterey County Board of Supervisor

On April of 1999, I had the opportunity to speak with District Three Monterey County Board of Supervisor Lou Calcagno. Lou Calcagno and I discussed the unincorporated status of Pajaro. According to Calcagno, unincorporated lands are governed by the governing Board of Supervisors for Monterey County.

According to Calcagno, District 3 was designed to have the highest population of Latino residents in the county. Calcagno also came to the conclusion that District 3 should be smaller. More specifically, District 3 should be divided between North County and South County since decreasing the size of the District would allow Calcagno to better represent communities.

When asked about the role of his position, Calcagno stated that his responsibility is, “To serve the communities and give them what the county has to offer.” Calcagno stated that the county needs to apply for more grants in order to serve the Pajaro community. Calcagno also stated that Monterey County is already $60 million behind in terms of developing unincorporated areas, $10 million being spent in a single year.
VII. Interview with Mary J. Claypool, Principal Administrative Analyst for the County of Monterey Environmental Resource Policy

The third Monterey County official I interviewed for this project was Mary J. Claypool, Principal Administrative Analyst for the County of Monterey Environmental Resource Policy. On October of 1999, Claypool and I discussed the unincorporated status of the Pajaro community. From the onset, Claypool acknowledged that unincorporation is not the underlying issue affecting Pajaro’s overall situation. It was only until the Loma Prieta earthquake of 1989 that Pajaro received the attention of community leaders and public officials. Through her efforts, Claypool was able to coordinate a tour of Pajaro consisting of federal government officials.

Claypool continued by stating that one needs to look at the fact that Monterey County consists of 20 of so unincorporated communities. Trying to budget limited resources within this number of unincorporated areas is difficult to manage. According to Mary, “We need money in Pajaro rental units order to create change in communities.” When asked what the advantages would be if Pajaro was annexed into Watsonville, Mary stressed the close proximity between both communities. A disadvantage for annexing Pajaro into the Santa Cruz County would be that, according to Mrs. Claypool, “the momentum that we started in redeveloping Pajaro might decrease because Watsonville might not have the same drive that Monterey County has to redevelop Pajaro as a way to right some wrongs of the past.”

When asked what advantages Pajaro would experience if it were an incorporated city, Mrs. Claypool stated that Pajaro would have greater local control, therefore, local concerns would be addressed more effectively and promptly. Incorporation would also bring the community closer together. The disadvantages of incorporation would also require that Pajaro cover city government expenses, since the county would not be required to offer certain resources that Pajaro receives at this moment by being unincorporated.
Our discussion concluded with a brief discussion of affordable housing. According to Mrs. Claypool, the major priority in the Monterey County is the lack of affordable housing. Whether supply will balance out with demand for affordable housing in Monterey County is not likely to happen in the near future. Another barrier preventing the construction of affordable housing in Monterey County is community response. Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) attitudes from surrounding property owners to proposed affordable housing projects discourage development proposals. However, it was raised that state mandates for affordable housing are present, thus a responsibility for everyone to advocate such housing developments for communities.
VIII. Watsonville’s Potential Interest in the Unincorporated Area of Pajaro

Realizing that county authorities must provide Pajaro residents with certain civic and human services raises questions as to the amount of revenue being distributed to Santa Cruz County. In other words, how is Watsonville being reimbursed for providing public services to Pajaro residents that live in a different county? According to Donald C. Menzel, editor of The American County: Frontiers of Knowledge, “A third substantially expanded role for counties is as a provider/coordinator/regulator of city services that cross municipal boundaries” (Menzel, p. xii). The major reason for cross-county service provision for Pajaro residents is cost efficiency. As Menzel points out, “One law of intergovernmental relations is that in periods of economic stress, local officials can expect less intergovernmental aid and more intergovernmental mandates. Mandates allow federal and state officials to satisfy policy demands and take political credit for doing so while shifting the financial burden to local taxpayers” (Menzel, p. 21). In the case of Pajaro residents, their financial burden for cross county service provision lies in the possibility that Pajaro residents might be paying higher tax fees and receiving little or no services.

There are no private medical or dental services are available in the Pajaro community along with a lack of pharmaceutical facilities. All such facilities are located throughout the Watsonville area. It is reasonable to suggest that Monterey County has not implemented such services in collaboration with Watsonville city officials in order to maintain Pajaro resident’s dependence with the city of Watsonville. Pajaro residents provide the Watsonville commercial industry with capital, a capital that would be invested in Pajaro if such services existed within its boundaries. According to a quote by Julie Conway of Pajaro Valley Housing Corporation, “The community people aren’t tied down by the typical way that problems get solved or projects get designed. They just know what the need is and have solid ideas about how it could change” (Pajaro, p. 19). Even though the Pajaro community understands its needs, the establishment of such services in the community would threaten the current commercial interests of Watsonville business owners dependent on the capital of Pajaro residents.

The city of Watsonville has recently completed a Futures Study forecasting current land availability, potential areas for housing development, and the reuse of commercial property no longer in use. What struck my attention to this study was its inclusion of Pajaro as a potential growth area. Why would Watsonville, a city that belongs to a different county, be investigating land use opportunities in the Pajaro area? Which Monterey County public official approved the investigation of potential land use in Pajaro by Watsonville city officials? Even though I was not capable of answering these questions in this paper, results
from the Pajaro Valley Futures Study raises interesting questions as to the future identity of the Pajaro community.

According to the study, the city of Watsonville has identified the need for 5,300 housing units to accommodate the anticipated population expansion of the city through the year 2005. Out of the 5,300 housing units the city of Watsonville has identified as needed by the year 2005, 1980 of those housing units need to be built outside Watsonville city boundaries. Of those 1980 housing units needed to be built outside Watsonville city limits, Pajaro’s 25 acres of vacant land identified for residential use would supply 148 housing units. There is a high probability that Pajaro will remain unincorporated by the year 2005. Without city status, Pajaro residents will either witness the development of housing for Watsonville residents or advocate the construction of much needed affordable housing projects. According to Frank Bardacke in his book, Good Liberals and Great Blue Herons, “Land is so expensive to acquire that affordable housing is impossible to build” (Bardacke, p. 86). Even if the 25 acres identified as residential use within Pajaro were approved for low-income housing, the property and funding costs associated with such projects would discourage realtors from their development in a market where housing options are demanded and profitably more accommodating by middle-class home buyers.
IX. Monterey County Existing Conditions Report for the Monterey County 21st Century General Plan Update Draft

Monterey County is currently in the process of updating its General Plan, a written document designed for regional land use planning. The original Monterey County General Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1982. Serving as an informational base, a draft of the Monterey County Existing Conditions Report for the Monterey County 21st Century General Plan Update identifies changes that have occurred since the adoption of the 1982 General Plan. The intended purpose of the report is to answer the question of “What type of community do we want Monterey County to be?” The lack to define the term “we” in the previous phrase is concerning due to the county’s composition of communities facing distance/transportation barriers, language barriers, and most importantly, exclusion in the planning process.

The Existing Condition Report estimates that Monterey County has a population of 391,322, 26% of them living in unincorporated areas. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) projects that the population of the Monterey County will reach 500,000 people, 130,000 of those living in unincorporated areas by the year 2020. Based on AMBAG’s findings, within a period of 20 years, unincorporated communities will witness a 28% increase in population. One must also take into account that unincorporated communities are required to maintain their boundary size based on policies protecting the interests of the agricultural industry. Within the past 5 years, unincorporated areas of Monterey County have produced almost half the growth in property tax revenues. The North Monterey County planning area is 114 square miles in size.

The Existing Conditions Report states that the area with the most potential for future development in Monterey County is located in the inland area of North County as the result of rapid employment and population growth in Silicon Valley. Without community involvement, Pajaro residents run the risk of being negatively affected by Silicon Valley’s push for housing. According to the Silicon Valley ‘99 Report, 230,000 new jobs have been created in Silicon Valley during the past 5 years. Only 35,000 new housing units have been constructed, thus increasing the median price for a single-family residence by 46%. It is estimated that 100,000 new housing units will be constructed in the Silicon Valley by 2010, which in no way would satisfy its current housing demand. The Pajaro community should be concerned about its existence as a Mexican immigrant community. As commercialism and the constant influx of middle-class Anglo American interests increase, so will the loss of Mexican cultural heritage and the small town feeling unique to Pajaro.

Currently, it is proposed that Pajaro will be an area of development concentration, meaning that the area will be given greater attention along with technical and economic
assistance. Without the designation for development concentration, communities receive low development assistance from the county. The Existing Conditions report continues by summarizing that since 1990, 10,135 single-family building permits were granted, compared to 2,208 multi-family building permits. Housing trends in Monterey County discriminate against Mexican descendant families of Pajaro since the majority of them nurture families with more than one child. The housing market of Monterey County is one cause for low-income families experiencing overcrowding in their homes. The shortage of multi-family affordable housing works against Mexican Immigrant communities since lack of housing forces them into renting situations. Rent prices, however, increase as community demand for housing increases.

The Williamson Act of 1965, implemented by the California Department of Conservation, was sponsored by Assemblyman John Williamson in order to protect agricultural and open space land in California against industrialization and the sprawling of suburban communities. In exchange to securing 10-year contracts with the California Department of Conservation, farmers get low tax assessments. According to Williamson Act procedures, farmers sign long-term contracts and receive protection from taxes. A larger tax base would be invested in the Pajaro Community by local farmers if it were not for the Williamson Act.

Subventions are also paid by the state for open space to cities and counties based on the quality and number of acres under contract. This is a very important fact throughout county-wide politics, especially in Monterey County. Not only do farmowners benefit from tax subsidies at the expense of under-represented communities, county districts and cities (urban prime land) also benefit from state subventions by maintaining open space land. Urban Prime Land is land located within 3 miles of cities of specified size. The Williamson Act, therefore, creates a situation where cities and county districts will not encourage any type of economic growth of unincorporated communities because doing so would simply lower the amount of yearly subventions received by the state. Monterey County District Board of Supervisors will not profit by encouraging development. It follows that LAFCO, an agency composed of two board of supervisors, will maintain their anti-growth stance over unincorporated communities. Molded together, the Cortese-Knox Act along with the Williamson Act, transform into an institutional structure of power and privilege that exploits the healthy development of all communities and the farmworkers who are caged in this closed circle of power that rewards dominant political hierarchies while excluding unincorporated communities represented by a board of supervisor. Besides economically benefiting farmowners through county subsidies for not developing their land, the county government benefits from maintaining prime agricultural land through state subventions. State subventions are utilized by county government to further increase the wealth of certain county sites by funding the tourist industry. In essence, the system is intended to close the circle of power to those who already possess power. How such power was gained by White upper-class males in California is questionable. In the majority of cases, power is maintained through the institutionalization of sexism, racism, classism, homophobia, ageism, and ableism, to name a few, within the Justice System, religious institutions, political system, educational institutions, and employment practices.
According to the Williamson Act 1990-91 Status Report, the Open Space Subvention Act of 1971 was enacted to partially replace foregone tax revenue experience by local governments participating in the program. The Williamson Act provides for assessing contracted land at the income or updated Proposition 13 value, whichever is usually lower (Contracted lands producing high income crops, which have changed ownership in many years, typically are valued at Proposition 13 levels) (Williamson).

A very important aspect that reaffirms my belief that the Williamson Act exploits unincorporated communities for the benefit of landowners and district government structures is found by the act’s definition of compatible uses of Williamson Act land, open space or prime agricultural land, throughout California and Monterey County. According to the 1990-91 Williamson Act Status Report, compatible uses of Williamson Act protected land might include:

I. Industrial warehouses
II. Auto repair shops
III. Recreational developments
IV. Private residential sewage treatment plants
V. Whole-parcel open-pit mining and processing
VI. Non-agricultural trucking operations

According to the Williamson Act, Golf courses are intended as recreational uses of protected lands. At the same time, poor families suffer from little to no recreational space within their neighborhoods. A sport such as golf that is considered an Anglo hobby, detracts working-class people of color and women who “Do not belong” in such settings. The Williamson Act 1990-91 status report also stated that conditional uses in Agricultural preserve zones in Yolo County, as recommended by the report included processing plants, wholesale nurseries, and research greenhouses. Once again, the conditional uses of agricultural preserves benefits those in power that can afford to establish such economic projects; projects that demand the cheap labor of farmworkers.
The use of compatible alternatives to Williamson Act lands serves as a loophole for landowners, county district government, and other special interests to increase capital accumulation on land that is supposedly protected by any such development. It is hypocritical of government structures to develop land for the economic well-being of those in power while unincorporated communities are immobilized against the development of much needed services and centers. This is a clear example that local government interests are established for the convenience of the state’s economic, political, and social well-being.

The Williamson Act not only subsidizes farmers, protects their land, encourages the economic value of such land through maturity, does not limit ownership of land by farmowners, but also exploits unincorporated communities, such as Pajaro, by providing tax cuts that would otherwise be invested in the community. Tax incentives for farmers are provided at the expense of the poor surrounding communities adjacent to farmland. It seems that the Williamson act is another structure for exploitation of farmworker communities in Monterey County.
XI. Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act: The Blueprint for Oppression

The systematic oppression of poor people’s communities and the burden they are forced to face in maintaining Monterey County’s billion dollar industry through surplus labor is outlined in the way local government is structured; the blueprint for this structure dependent upon racism, sexism, and classism is found within the pages of the Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985. This act outlines the basis for preserving the business interests of agriculture while setting the rules of how city, county, and other designs compete for revenue. The Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985 is a legalized tool to protect the agricultural interests of California farmers versus the business interests of land developers. In both instances, the goal of land developers and mass agricultural farmers is to increase personal wealth at the expense of the land and poor families who receive unlivable wages and will not be able to afford newly developed housing opportunities.

Backed up by a state funded governmental agency, agricultural interests in the Monterey County are rewarded and receive class privilege simply by owning land. As the Cortese-Knox act preserves open space and usable land for agriculture, it also pins municipal government and county governments against each other for capital. While farmers who own land, get government subsidies in case their product does not meet government standards, unincorporated communities receive absolutely no governmental protection and guarantees against poverty and self-sufficiency.

As I stated previously, one popular safeguard strategy used to further increase the class well-being of certain cities in Monterey is tourism. Interestingly, certain Monterey County residents have played into the belief that revenue generated by the tourist and the agricultural industry benefit the entire county. This belief does not take into account that such revenue is not equally distributed to communities that need to be exploited in order to maintain county surplus labor to work the fields and the low-wage tourist jobs. As county districts received thousands in subsidies for open-space preservation, unincorporated communities are oppressed when housing, community centers, health facilities, and recreational needs are raised in public.

The information provided in this section comes from the 1996 updated version of the original act created in 1985. According to Richard Rainey, Chairman of the California Legislature - Assembly Committee on Local Government, “The Cortese-Knox Local Government changes of organization, including a city incorporation, annexation to a city or special district, and consolidation of cities or special districts” (Cortese, p. I) According to Rainey, “Among the purposes of LAFCO’s are the discouragement of urban sprawl and
the encouragement of the orderly formation and development of local agencies” (Cortese, p. I).

The purpose of the 1985 Cortese-Knox Act was to consolidate three laws that governed changes in boundaries, organization in cities, and special districts. The following three laws include:

- Knox-Nisbet Act of 1963
- District Reorganization Act of 1965
- Municipal Organization Act of 1977

The consolidated law was introduced to the California state legislature as AB115 by Assembly Dominic Cortese in December 1984 and signed by governor Deukmejian in September 9, 1985. The Assembly Publications office has all amended versions of the Cortese-Knox Act of 1985. In order to simplify the material in the Cortese-Knox Act publication, I have chosen those legislative policies that most impact unincorporated communities while describing their consequences in terms of privilege and oppression.

**Legislative Policy (LP) 56001:**

According to Legislative Policy (LP) 56001, “The legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state to encourage orderly growth and development which are essential to the social, fiscal, and economic well-being of the state” (Cortese, p. 1). This statement does not address the definition of orderly growth and whether it is possible to encourage orderly growth to communities of different ethnic backgrounds with barriers preventing them from community participation and decision making. It is also evident from the statement above that the social, fiscal, and economic well-being of the state come before the social, fiscal, and economic well-being of communities that are not represented within the state, that are deemed problematic aspects of the state, or inclusive of community members that cannot participate in state decisions because they are tax-paying residents who are denied voting rights. The passing of propositions 187, 209, 21, and 22 are indicators that the economic well-being of the state does not include people of color, women, and gay/lesbian other economically subjugated groups. The “encouragement of orderly growth and development essential to the social, fiscal, and economic well-being of the state” is another way of stating that a legalized right to strategically create growth and developmental opportunities for upper-class white males is essential to the continual mechanization of racism, sexism, and classism.

The same policy states that, “The legislature recognizes that when areas become urbanized to the extent that they need the full range of services, priorities are required to be established regarding the type and levels of services that the residents of an urban community need and desire” (Cortese, p. 1). I can agree with this statement to the extent
that prioritized services for communities need to receive immediate attention while all other services be available conveniently accessible outside the community if decisions were community approved. However, LP 56001 prioritizes community service needs against community financial resources and “to reflect local circumstances, conditions, and limited financial resources” (Cortese, p. 1). It is my impression that poor communities are punished for being poor and limited to the prioritization of needs; needs that are not necessarily decided upon by members of unincorporated communities.

**Legislative Policy (LP) 56021:**
According to (LP) 56021: A “change of organization” includes:
- A city incorporation - recognition of a city.
- A district formation - This includes county districts, each one represented by a county board supervisor.
- An annexation to, or detachment from, a city or district - This includes unincorporated communities being included into city boundaries.
- A dissolution of a city
- A district dissolution
- A consolidation of cities or special districts
- A merger or establishment of a subsidiary district

This section is important since it outlines all other possible alternatives to unincorporated status of communities. However, all the alternatives mentioned above are based on preserving the interests of agriculturists and property owners. Any change in governmental structure would bring short-term gains but will not provide long-term solutions to population growth, race, sex, class discrimination, labor rights, and financial security for low-income families. Any governmental structure that prioritizes capital accumulation at the expense of safeguarding an adequate quality of life for all is not a viable option.

**Legislative Policy 56029:**
According to LP 56029, the conducting authority, meaning the legislative body of an affected city, county, or district is authorized by the Land Area Formation Commission (LAFCO) to conduct proceedings for a change in organization (Cortese, p. 4). This means that the city of Watsonville would be the conducting authority if Pajaro decided to annex, detach, or incorporate into the city. In addition, the board of supervisors of the county whose boundaries would change as a result of a proposed annexation or incorporation of an area would be the conducting authority. Taken together, Pajaro’s decision to annex, incorporate, or detach would not be conducted by the community itself and not officially
recognized by the state. In essence, the Pajaro community, and all unincorporated communities in general, have no institutional power to decide its boundaries and its immediate provision of human services.

**Legislative Policy 56041:**

According to LP 56041, an “‘Improvement district’ means a district, area, or zone formed for the sole purpose of designating an area which is to bear a special tax or assessment for an improvement benefiting that area” (Cortese, p. 8). This LP raises questions regarding Pajaro’s improvement status and whether Pajaro residents are paying higher taxes without full understanding. This LP also clarifies the fact that improvements to historically underrepresented areas do not stem from generosity. Taxes are raised to subsidize improvement expenses for services that should be provided to such communities in the first place. The impression given is that underrepresented/exploited communities that are comprised primarily of unincorporated communities of color, will pay an extra fee for needed services brought to the attention of public officials as a result of a community disaster or mass protest. This instance has played out in the Pajaro community more than once, verifying that Pajaro’s needs are usually met in response to an overall shock to community functioning whether it includes flood disasters, pesticide poisoning of underground reservoirs, to earthquake relief, and lack of public services.

**Legislative Policy 56043:**

Interestingly, LP 56043 states that “Any area proposed for incorporation as a new city shall have at least 500 registered voters residing within the affected area at the time LAFCO proceedings are initiated” (Cortese, p. 8). At this moment, Pajaro has about 3,500 community members, the majority being California residents. This fact is very important and can explain why county officials prefer to minimize unincorporated community growth by discouraging services, low-income housing, subsidized housing, and the increase of rental opportunities. Increasing the number of citizen status members within unincorporated communities would signify the potential for community action against the centralization aspect of district-wide governance in unincorporated communities. Also, preventing the growth of unincorporated communities and discouraging civic participation limits the adequate amount of potential voters which leads to little change in policy and the actual ability to choose public representatives. In a democratic society, person’s with residential status can’t vote for representatives, initiatives, propositions, and can’t sign up for petition drives.

**Legislative Policy 56047.5:**

According to LP 56047.5, an “interested agency” means each local agency which provides facilities or services in the affected territory that a subject agency would provide”
(Cortese, p. 9). Clearly, Watsonville can be considered an interested agency due to its adjacent proximity to the Pajaro community. Interested agencies surrounding unincorporated communities, in this case Santa Cruz County, provides certain public services for Pajaro that Monterey County would provide if the geographic circumstances differed. However, it is highly likely that Monterey County would adequately provide for Pajaro if it were not surrounded by a city. In this case, Pajaro would look identical to other unincorporated communities which are (It is important to note that not all unincorporated communities in Monterey County are underrepresented such as the ones outlined located on the table):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unincorporated Community:</th>
<th>Unincorporated Community:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aromas</td>
<td>Boronda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Chualar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Lomas</td>
<td>San Ardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lucas</td>
<td>Spreckels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The problem with this LP is the unacknowledged need to establish a specific agency that overseas all inter-county supervision of contracts providing services for Pajaro residents.

**Legislative Policy 56110:**

According to LP 56110, “Territory may not be annexed to a city unless it is located in the same county” (Cortese, p. 18). This LP is the ultimate barrier to having Watsonville annex the territory which is currently Pajaro. Constant reservation of land for purposes other than better serving communities raises doubts over the county’s concern for the well-being of the Pajaro community. If the Pajaro community decided to become part of Watsonville through annexation of the community, the following LP would have to be eliminated from the current Cortese-Knox political guidelines.

**Legislative Policy 56111:**

Along LP 56111, “A city may annex noncontiguous territory not exceeding 300 feet in area which is located in the same county as that in which the city is situated, and which is owned by the city and is being used for municipal purposes” (Cortese, p. 18). This LP states that Watsonville, if an agreement was made to annex Pajaro into its territory, an additional 300 feet further Pajaro’s boundaries could also be included. In other words, noncontiguous territory is land surrounding any newly annexed space but not exceeding 300 feet. This LP gives cities the ability to continue their expansion outside their boundaries as long as the territory is owned by the city and/or facilities have been created to serve city needs.

**Legislative Policy 56121:**
According to LP 56121, “No change of organization or reorganization, or any term or condition of a change of organization or reorganization, shall impair the rights of any bondholder or other creditor of any county, city, or district” (Cortese, p. 28). The consequences of the following LP is the flexibility for discretion by LAFCO, bondholders, and/or creditors to deny any reorganization proposal for Pajaro that would threaten economic interests holders of titles and or economic property. Denying reorganization proposals intended to increase the well-being of Pajaro in exchange for the continued economic security of special interests and their contracts raises questions in terms of established power structures perpetuated by upper to middle class Monterey County residents and their deprioritization of unincorporated community empowerment.

**Legislative Policy 56123:**

According to LP 56123, “If a proposed change of organization or a reorganization applies to two or more affected counties, for the purpose of this division, exclusive jurisdiction shall be vested in the officers of the principal county” (Cortese, p. 29). The policy continues by stating that principal officers not of principal county shall cooperate “to enable the officers of the principal county to comply with this division.” This amendment states that the board of supervisors would be held as the principal officers if the unincorporated community of Pajaro decided to reorganize within Santa Cruz County territory. Designating negotiation ability to Monterey County Board of Supervisors, along with LAFCO’s executive board which includes board of supervisors, definitely secures the interests of the agricultural industry. Pajaro’s lack of official city council or representative only increases the institutionalized power that LAFCO and the county have over unincorporated communities.

**Legislative Policy 56124:**

According to LP 56124, exclusive jurisdiction may be vested to officers other than principal county regarding any change of organization or reorganization if all the following occurs:

- The commission of the principal county approves of having exclusive jurisdiction in another affected county.
- The commission of the principal county designates the affected county which shall assume exclusive jurisdiction.
- The commission of the affected county so designated agrees to assume exclusive jurisdiction.

This legislative policy identifies the potential for the Monterey County to distribute jurisdiction of Pajaro to Santa Cruz County if the guidelines were met. Distributing
jurisdiction of Pajaro from Monterey County raises the assumption that Santa Cruz will not produce the same results of underrepresenting the Pajaro community. It would be wise to pursue this option in the event that all efforts within the Monterey County to increase the autonomy of Pajaro failed; therefore, proceeding with the same process within Santa Cruz County.

**Legislative Policy 56133:**

According to LP 56133, “A city or district may provide new or extended services by contract or agreement outside its jurisdictional boundaries only if it first requests and receives written approval from the LAFCO in the affected county” (Cortese, p. 37). This LP states that “new” or “extended” services such as public safety, sewer and sanitation, road maintenance, and waste management to name a few, can be contracted over to the city of Watsonville if Monterey County found it cost effective. In addition, such contracts and agreements must be filed by Monterey County LAFCO; files that are open for viewing by Pajaro residents who would like to verify the legitimacy and terms of such business transactions. Such contracts include all contract and agreements derived as a result of redevelopment efforts, redevelopment efforts that need to be inspected by the ordinary community resident of Pajaro who will be affected by development of community and the types of development taking place. The following policy must include all contracts and agreements that involve public health services, economic development services, and all other human services that Pajaro residents typically receive in Watsonville due to its proximity to the area. Identifying all inter-county contract and agreements between San Benito, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz County is crucial to establishing a political stance with a clear understanding of what services need to be provided within the community. This in turn would establish specific requests for the development of facilities within Pajaro and service agencies to fill the newly constructed space. This development of facilities and the provision of services for Pajaro would circulate tax revenue within the community, reduce all barriers to acquire much needed services, while providing potential jobs for youth and community members interests in such community service fields.

**Legislative Policy 56301:**

According to LP 56301, “Among the purposes of LAFCO are the discouragement of urban sprawl and the encouragement of the orderly formation and development of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances” (Cortese, p. 41). The Pajaro community does not receive the attention and urgency to develop public services in part because its considered a sprawl community, a community that is not developing in an “orderly formation” and thus should not exist in the first place. The sprawled community stereotype deflects the responsibility of local government’s classist regulations that privilege
upper and middle class males through racist and sexist exploitation of unincorporated community members who are mostly comprised of Mexican immigrant and migrant farmworkers. It is interesting how development for the well-being of the Monterey tourist industry and the wealthy few who profit from it are not labeled as perpetuators of sprawl. On the other hand, unincorporated communities that desperately need to develop services and opportunities for greater levels of self-sustainability are scapegoated and demonized as the root cause to the county’s. Such stereotypical images are derived by several means; in this case, Monterey County’s lack to institutionalize mechanisms ensuring political participation of underrepresented communities such as Pajaro and other unincorporated communities.

I must also raise the issue of “orderly formation and development of local agencies based on local conditions and circumstances.” The LP gives the impression that orderly formation and development cannot be decided by the community itself, that LAFCO must make such decisions on behalf of the $3 billion dollar agricultural interest in Monterey County. I must also raise the issue of basing the development of self-sustainable infrastructure according to the “local conditions and circumstances.” This quote simply gives the LAFCO executive board, comprised of at least two district supervisors, virtually all power to interpret the conditions and circumstances for developing unincorporated communities comprised primarily of Mexican immigrants and migrant farmworkers.

**Legislative Policy 56325:**

According to LP 56325, five executive LAFCO members consist of:

- Two board of supervisors.
- Two representing the cities in the county.
- One representing the general public appointed by the four members of the commission.

The selection process for LAFCO’s executive committee and the absence of a representative for unincorporated communities is biased, unjust, and controlled by those already in power. The composition of LAFCO executives establishes a conflict of interest for unincorporated communities who must go through both the board of supervisors and LAFCO for negotiation of reorganization proposals. In essence, the board of supervisors have power to exterminate any proposal requesting a change in boundaries for Pajaro because of the board’s legalized authority within LAFCO, as an independent entity, and their influence on special interests within Pajaro. Unincorporated communities, as independent entities, are given absolutely no leverage to negotiate zoning, planning, and proposing development decisions within and throughout surrounding space. This last fact carries particular weight in communities that are predominantly Spanish-speaking, farmworking, and have little to no
residents possessing citizenship voting status. In essence, Mexican immigrant-based unincorporated communities are practically invisible within the Monterey County’s traditional decision-making process.

**Legislative Policy 56375:**

According to LP 56375, “LAFCO shall have the powers and duties to review and approve or disapprove with or without amendment, wholly, partially, or conditionally, proposals for changes of organization or reorganizations” (Cortese, p. 52). LAFCO does have the power to initiate a consolidation of districts, dissolution, merger, or reorganization. However, LAFCO does not have the power to disapprove an annexation initiated by a resolution. The LP continues by stating that “LAFCO shall not impose any conditions that would directly regulate land use density or intensity, property development, or subdivision requirements.” The quote, however, falsely acknowledges the fact that directly imposed decisions by LAFCO do occur since 2/5 of LAFCO’s executive body is composed of board of supervisors. LAFCO is not a neutral policy making entity throughout local government. Its intend is to regulate land use density or intensity, property development, or subdivision requirements for the well-being of mass agriculturists and the established power structure. Either direct or indirect, LAFCO decisions affect low-income families in drastic ways; primarily in preventing approvals for much needed space to build community centers, health clinics, and recreational parks in unincorporated communities.

According to the same LP, LAFCO shall determine the property tax revenue to be exchanged in case of incorporation of Pajaro and to authorize a city or district to provide new or extended services outside its jurisdictional boundaries. Finally, if Pajaro proposed to become a city, it would be expected to provide services and facilities and possess a reserve for three fiscal years following incorporation. The state-mandated requirement for newly created cities to have a three-year financial reserve covering city services and facility expenses serves to deter unincorporated communities demanding higher levels of self-determination political representation. First, LAFCO has the authority to prevent healthy development that would benefit the community and would increase the community’s economic infrastructure by naming it urban sprawl. Secondly, the city of Watsonville will lose tremendous amounts of revenue invested in the city if Pajaro provided its own services and commercial needs. Thirdly, Pajaro’s newly acquired city status would allow the community to regulate its own boundaries, wage taxes on currently established businesses and Pajaro residents, and decentralize power away from a ineffective and interest-driven board of supervisor form of governance over unincorporated communities.

**Legislative Policy 56377:**
According to LP 56377, “conversion of open space land to other than open space land is possible if all the following is met:

- Development or use of land for other than open space uses shall be guided away from existing prime agricultural lands, unless that action would not promote the planned, orderly, and efficient development of an area.
- Development of existing vacant or nonprime agricultural lands for urban uses within the existing jurisdiction of a local agency should be encouraged before any proposal is approved which would allow for or lead to development of existing open space lands for non-open-space uses which are outside of the existing jurisdiction of the local agency (Cortese, p. 58).

This specific LP serves as a loophole for the development of open-space land intended to benefit the interests of those in power. I refer specifically to the construction of golf courses as alternative development, as stated in the Williamson Act and actual proof of such developments surrounding the Pajaro community. This type of development is racially, sexually, and class biased since the majority persons who would use a golfing facility are upper to middle-class white men. I question whether low-income migrant farmworkers and their children have the luxury or desire to use a golfing facility when other more immediate needs and services are not being met such as neighborhood recreational parks, community centers, higher wages, and opportunities for self-sustainability for community. This LP serves those in power to “bend the rules,” since they have been given the authority by the state to do so; a state that is managed by an elite few who will profit from alternative options to policies at the expense of the poor in Monterey County.

Legislative Policy 56388:

According to LP 56388, exclusive jurisdiction for matters authorized to a county other than the principal county is possible if Monterey County LAFCO agrees to having the exclusive jurisdiction vested to the LAFCO of another county, designates the LAFCO of another county which shall assume exclusive jurisdiction, and the designated commission agrees to assume exclusive jurisdiction. (Cortese, p. 62). The ramifications of this specific LP as a result of political pressure placed on LAFCO and the Monterey County Board of Supervisors by the people of Pajaro and Watsonville combined would allow another venue for the exploration of Pajaro’s reorganization. This LP would be crucial in the case that all negotiations for Pajaro’s reorganization to greater self-sufficiency were denied by LAFCO and the Monterey County Board of Supervisors. However, a tremendous amount of collaborative mobilization would have to be created between residents of Santa Cruz and Monterey County such boycotts, walkouts, strikes, and civil disobedience, educational sit-ins, and most importantly, community visioning between people of color and the
surrounding agricultural community. The outcome of the visioning process would be devoted towards understanding the skills that Pajaro residents possess, establish entrepreneurship opportunities for self-sustainability, highlight Pajaro’s Indigenous and Chicana and Chicano cultural heritage as the foundation for all political decision-making, and build opportunities for self-determination of the residents.

**Legislative Policy 56425:**
According to LP 56425, “In determining the sphere of influence of each local agency, the commission shall consider and prepare a written statement of its determinations with respect to each of the following:

- The present and planned uses in the area, including agricultural and open space lands.
- The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.
- The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services which the agency provides or is authorized to provide.
- The existence of any social and economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency (Cortese, p. 63).

Along the same lines as LP 56388, this LP signifies that: First, Monterey County LAFCO has the authority to contract with the city of Watsonville and the county of Santa Cruz to provide services to Pajaro which is situated in a different county. Secondly, Santa Cruz County LAFCO could be pressured into supporting Pajaro’s incorporation as a city, therefore, eliminating Monterey County LAFCO’s middle-person role. Direct negotiations in terms of providing for Pajaro’s services and facilities while proposing the establishment of new facilities in the newly created community would save thousands of dollars by funding the salary of Pajaro’s mayor, city manager, and city councilpersons.

**Legislative Policy 56653:**
According to LP 56653, In the case that Pajaro decided to submit a proposal for incorporation, a plan for providing services within the newly incorporated city would require:

- A description of services to be extended to the affected territory.
- The level and range of those services.
- An indication of when those services can feasibly be extended to the affected territory.
- An indication of any improvement or upgrading of structures, roads, sewer or water facilities, or other conditions the local agency would impose or require within the affected territory.
- Information with respect to how those services will be financed.
Proposal for the change in organization for the Pajaro community can be done by petition which included the signatures of registered voters and landowners. Before any petition is circulated a notice of intent to circulate a petition must be created and published in the major newspaper of the area. This aspect of the LP does not take into account that the majority of unincorporated communities in Monterey County are composed of California residents who cannot vote because they do not possess citizenship status. Meanwhile, families established in unincorporated communities have paid income, property, and other taxes for as long as they have immigrated in California. Petition drives based on the participation of persons with citizenship are discriminatory of persons who do not have citizenship status but are obligated to pay taxes. Circulation of petitions to landowners and citizen residents will represent their best interests and not the interests of the Pajaro community; and any other unincorporated community to this matter. Legitimacy of the democratic process in communities that can’t be represented and exercise their right to choose is flawed.

**Legislative Policy 56702:**

According to LP 56702, along with landowners, public and federal agencies owning land in the proposed area for incorporation are deemed landowners for the purpose of signing the petition for organization or reorganization (Cortese, p. 83). Depending whether public and federal agencies are supportive of the community’s desire for greater autonomy, this LP can either benefit or deter proposals for Pajaro’s incorporation. The likelihood that public and federal agencies support proposal’s contrary to LAFCO or the state are minimal. The decisive factor in deterring public and federal agency’s support of efforts within unincorporated communities are threats of budget cuts and employee layoffs. In other words, powers do exist to deter support contrary to LAFCO and the board of supervisors if either of the two parties felt their interests were threatened.

**Legislative Policy 56750:**

According to LP 56750, any plan for incorporation of a city must be signed either by no less than 25 percent of the registered voters of the area and no less than 25 percent of registered landowners residing in the area “who also own more than 25 percent of the assessed value of land within the territory proposed to be incorporated” (Cortese, p. 87). At this moment, Pajaro does not have 25% of its population eligible to vote. In order to promote the establishment or reorganization of a new government structure within unincorporated communities, activist struggles to increase the number of citizens in such communities must be waged.

**Legislative Policy 56753:**
According to LP, 56753, in the case of annexation, any petition for such a change in organization must include more than 5 percent of the registered voters in the proposed area along with more than 5 percent of the owners of land within the area to be annexed who also own more than 5 percent of the assessed value of land within the proposed territory. This LP is not the obstacle that unincorporated communities must face in proposing annexation; for the majority of unincorporated communities in Monterey County that are virtually segregated from neighboring cities, annexation is not an option. The obstacle established by Cortese-Knox policy for Pajaro’s desire to be annexed into Watsonville, if that was a decided option, would come from LP 56755 which states that, “in the case of annexation of [the] territory [of Pajaro] from Monterey County District Three, a petition must be signed within District Three to include:”

- In registered voter districts - More than 5 percent of all registered voters.
- In landowner-voter districts - More than 5 percent of landowners who own more than 5 percent of the assessed value of land (Cortese, p. 88).

The option to annex into another city is virtually impossible for unincorporated communities located in district three, the largest district in the county that is dominated by agricultural interests and farmworking communities not able to vote. Monterey County District Three has the characteristics of a cage preventing upward mobility of the farmworking community, a community composed of a surplus labor force vulnerable to exploitation through cheap wages, lack of legal representation, educational advancement, and the internalization of all oppressions by the farmworking community.

Fortunately, the situation faced by unincorporated communities in Monterey County’s District Three is not hopeless. Through democratic participation through massive solidarity between Monterey and Santa Cruz County residents, action can be taken to see that all communities receive all the incentives and services necessary for upward mobility and self-sustainability. This can occur through the request that District Three be divided into separate districts, giving each equal value in terms of facilities, open space, prime farmland, natural habitat and future healthy development of

Corner between Porter Dr. and Salinas Rd.
such lots. In a state were the centralization of political, economical, and social power is the
goal, decentralization of space that would be primarily managed by farmworkers and all
other residents is revolutionary. Taking this step would serve as a model to other counties
and communities needing of greater self-determination while facing political obstacles. It
seems that the first obstacle would be to delete the Cortese-Knox agreement and replace it
with another structural guide towards local government that is inclusive of all persons,
especially women of color and the poor working-class. According to Legislative Policy
56758, the minimum requirement needed to approve a petition for the dissolution of a
district, in this case District Three, is the signature of:

- In resident voter districts - More than 5 percent of the registered voters within
  the district.
- In landowner voter districts - More than 5 percent of the registered voters within
  the district who own more than 5 percent of the assessed value of land within
  that district.

If the petition is denied by LAFCO or the county board of supervisors, a resolution can be
agreed upon by the previous petitioners and a larger group of supporters with the intent of
putting pressure to approve the dissolution request. The will of the people can make
change, not LAFCO, not the board of supervisors, and not the state. However, steps must
be taken to ensure that such change will take place.
XIII. Pajaro Community Scan April 5th, 2000

On April 5th, 2000 I had the opportunity to do a community scan of Pajaro, California. The day was sunny with a light wind surrounding the blue sky. As I entered the community I saw a sign that said Pajaro: A Community of Royal Oaks. I realized that Royal Oaks is trying to proprietorize the small community of Pajaro for its own economic infrastructure. Later on that day, I saw the same sign posted just after 1400 San Juan Road, at least 6 miles east from the center of the Pajaro community.

Knowing that I would start my community scan on Railroad Avenue, the southern boundary of Pajaro, I parked the car between the Pajaro Valley Laundry Mat and the Pajaro Food Center. Getting off the car, I saw the PSW 13 tag and a crossed out NSW 14 tag on the wall of a building a few yards in front of me. I continued to walk forward when a danger sign caught my attention. I looked at the sign and it said that poisonous material were located there. The company name was Soilsew. I was curious to know how Soilsew used its chemicals.

As I continued to walk towards Railroad Avenue on the left side of the street, I noticed that there were no stop lights throughout the community of Pajaro. At the same time, a never-ending stream of cars drove through the community. I asked myself, how do children cross the street? Why are they forced to run the risk of being hit by a car? What kind of system would allow such a thing to happen? It was as if Pajaro was suffering from a bleeding wound, a slash right down its body that did not allow it to rest. Throughout Salinas Rd., there are no street lights; simply markers on the road pavement with on-going traffic with speeds that reached up to 45 mph. It seemed that someone divided the community in two, as if a river of cars must be crossed to get to the other side.
Then, I noticed that virtually all the buildings in Pajaro were either agricultural processing plants or distribution centers where truckers filled up their cargo with the vegetables grown and packaged by Pajaro residents. My instincts told me that the majority of the positions located in Pajaro that pay a moderate level wages are management and commercial positions taken by White middle-class men. Along Railroad Ave., I saw an irrigation ditch and a group of children playing in it. Five youth, the oldest one being six years old, where playing with pesticide and fertilizer contaminated water. Their names were: Analí Ortiz, Sergio Cabrera, Alejandro Ortiz, Mariaelena Cabrera, and Jose Cabrera. When I asked them where they played every day when school ends, they said right there. There was no place for them to go after school except those irrigation ditches. Without a worry the children would cross the street, not paying attention to possible traffic.

Soon after I ran into a woman who was talking to another woman, her name was Maria Gonzales and has lived in Pajaro for the past year. She was previously from Zacatecas, Mexico and immigrated north to work in the fields. When I asked her what she thought of Pajaro, she said that it was ugly and there were no opportunities for recreation or things to enjoy oneself. Both women began to tell me that there was nothing to do there for women. When asked what they would like to see in Pajaro, Maria mentioned that she would like to see more things for the children. Maria stated that she would also like to pursue her education but was prevented from doing so because of work, a complete lack of free time, and added domestic responsibilities.

homeless persons a day during seasonal harvest periods), the majority being from Watsonville who don’t have a space to sleep at the Salvation Army Shelter which prioritizes women and children. The Mission open their doors at 7:00PM, force mandatory showers, have chapel service, and have some food for the homeless men. They must leave the next day at 5:45AM. Michael stated that the majority of the homeless are Latino males who are migrant farmworkers that come from Mexico and go back home when the work is done. When asked what should be done to improve the situation of the homeless, Mark stated that more involvement with the homeless must take place because there are no day shelters for the homeless and no place for them to make phone calls. The homeless men simply hang out at the Watsonville Plaza every day or walk the streets. Mark continued by stating that he would like to see training programs, then Michael adds that training programs, certain medical, and other service centers for the homeless because Watsonville facilities will not service residents with a Pajaro or persons who don’t have an address.

The conversation then shifted to the flood of ‘95. According to our conversation, a lot of money was provided to repair the community and provide services. However, the money was invested uphill in the community of Royal Oaks. This created a very serious problem because no improvements were made in Pajaro; Pajaro residents still have to go across the bridge into Watsonville for services due to District Three money distribution trends.

As I walked back to the main part of Pajaro, I started jotting down the types of stores and other businesses surrounding the area. All the food markets in Pajaro sell alcohol and mostly all the businesses in the area are agricultural processing plants or auto shops; all located within one of each other. This clearly explained that workers, which are Pajaro residents, continue to be exploited in their own community. The smell of propane and smoke was evident throughout the community. As I walked down Associated Ln. I saw a petroleum storage company surrounded by rental homes and youth people playing in the area. Members to Moreno petroleum were Citgo Lubricants and CFN. I wondered how Citgo and CFN exploited global landscape? Walking towards Pajaro Middle School, I question why I have not seen any police officers around? Even though a Sheriff Satellite is located inside Porter Mansion, I only noticed a patrolling Sheriff twice within a four hour time span.
On a street to the left of Pajaro Middle School, I noticed a woman playing with children. I approached her and asked if the site was a childcare center. She replied no and said that Children's Services International is the childcare center in Pajaro. Then I saw a little girl playing with all the other children Maria Ramirez was childsitting. Mayeli Ramirez was two years old and had no other place to go but to Maria since Mayeli’s mother, a single mother, works in the fields to support her children.

According to Maria, working on Saturdays is very common for single-mothers and women farmworkers. When asked whether Children’s Services International was sufficient enough child care for the entire community of Pajaro, Maria quickly responded by stating that it was not sufficient for all the children in Pajaro. After talking with Maria, I headed further down the street onto a railroad track adjacent to strawberry fields (the west portion of Pajaro). Between the railroad track and the strawberry fields was an irrigation ditch. From a distance, a young man in his early twenties walks down the tracks. His head was facing the ground. I felt a pain, a sense of despair in his eyes. It seemed like there was nothing for him in Pajaro, his home community where the majority of support should be located. I felt outraged, I felt desperate to do something. To take away some of the grief he was somehow facing. I also felt that we were going to meet again; somehow.

Then I began walking back to Salinas Rd. and noticed all the children playing outside their homes and with their bicycles. I noticed all the abandoned cars and used car shops located all over the community. How would shape the worldview of a resident who lives in such an environment. What does it do to a young child’s vision of the world when all she or he sees is normalized poverty; a poverty that is accepted as a fact of life. There were no sidewalks, plenty of dirt roads, and once again, no stops sign for pedestrians. There were so many children. But where were the young women and young men? Where were the gangsters who wrote PSW on the walls of the run-down processing plant? I was curious whether Prop. 22 and the Sheriff Satellite played a role in the absence of the young leaders. There were run-down mobiles homes scattered all throughout the community. I also witnessed a run-down house with a tin roof. How do such conditions exist in a
community with so much many profit-making businesses? Further down Brooklyn St. where the tin roof house was located, I came across a building with the sign “cantina,” meaning bar. Across the street was the Lico-Greco Tot Lot Park. How can children and women feel safe playing in this are when drunken men stroll across the street everyday? Even more outraging was the fact that there were only two playground structures in that lot; both were old McDonald structures previously located in Watsonville.

I saw a young girl named Vanessa who was playing by herself on the McDonald slide. I introduced myself and asked for her name. I noticed that she felt uncomfortable with my attempts to ask her questions. This was clearly a sign that she did not trust me. What disturbed me was her frozen reaction. Being in a nervous state, Vanessa practically froze and showed her vulnerability and fear. It made me very sad to know that any potential to harm her by other men would be very easy. I left Vanessa’s presence feeling deep pain and anguish, knowing that so much work needed to be done in Pajaro by the Pajaro residents themselves and so many systems of exploitation needed be uncovered. A few yards from the playground was a liquid gas company named Alliance. Alliance, being a member of Liquid, emitted propane fumes and other gases. Located right across Alliance were residential homes.

As I looked westward from the Alliance building, I was surprised to see a dark brown colored building that was practically isolated from all other aspects of Pajaro. Then I notice a sign; Granite Construction Heavy Division. Surrounding the Granite facility were trailers, shacks, and empty lots. As I approach the facilities, I notice an entrance to the Pajaro levee and I walk toward it. On the levee, I notice that the Pajaro River is full of shrubbery and trees; as if no maintenance has been performed in that part of the river.

Walking towards San Juan Rd. and Porter Dr., I notice a two-story building that could serve as a potential low-income housing facility. The sign of the building was “The Idle Inn Cafe.” According to the owner of Baterias Jose, a car battery shop, the Mexican
descendant owner of the Idle Inn Cafe cannot develop the building because he is prevented building permits. It is surprising to see the sprawling of businesses that are taking place in the community. There are four bar establishments, two of the three gasoline centers located in Pajaro sell alcohol along with two of the three restaurants located in the community. Along Pajaro’s Porter Dr. and Salinas Rd., a length less of a mile, 15 auto shops are located. There are three centers that produce chemical or oil products within the community and only 7 community service-type facilities are located within Pajaro. The total figures don’t take into account that the east side of Pajaro was not inventoried. Either way, Pajaro is being taken over by short-term business interests, while avoiding the creation of an official community center that would offer services to all the Pajaro residents and would bring service learners from CSUMB to raise awareness of a variety of issues. Clearly, Pajaro residents are not taken into account when in comes to proposing recreational and intellectual opportunities.
XII. Summary of Interview with Pajaro Women

On March 17, 2000, I had the privilege to interview a group of women who were participating in a health conference facilitated by Sister Dolores. All the women did not speak English and some brought their children. After introducing myself, I began by asking them a basic question, “What is the importance of political participation?” After some silence, Sister Dolores rephrased the question by asking about all the responsibilities that women of the group face on a daily basis. It was then that women began sharing their stories and responsibilities such as the need to “dirigir la familia,” (To guide the family, the children, all the women in the group). Another participant mentioned the need for more doctors and police “para que nos den mas tiquetes” (So the police can give us more tickets). The women who identified the specific need for public safety recognized that public safety has included injustice in the form of undeserved police tickets.

The conversation soon shifted to, “Who is responsible for voicing the opinions of the community? One woman commented, “Todos tenemos responsabilidad” (All of us have the responsibility to make sure their community of Pajaro is represented). It was mentioned within the group that “si no participamos, no se va ser nada” (If we don’t participate, nothing is going to be done). To show how women took leadership in the past, Sister Dolores reminded the group of women about the flood and how a majority of people, the majority being men, stood up to state their concerns during a flood relief meeting that was organized. Sister Dolores continued the story by mentioning that women also took leadership when their issues were not being addressed by the men. Sister Dolores mentioned to the group that there are plenty of women leaders in Pajaro “pero se tienen que sentir que ustedes pueden representar la comunidad” (But all of you have to feel that you can be representatives of the community). Then a women stated, “Es que nunca nos piden opiniones” (They never ask us for our opinions).

When the discussion shifted to public services, one woman stated, “No quieren que tengamos nada” (They don’t want us to have anything). I then asked the group what services they would like to see in their community of Pajaro. The services included:

- Houses for rent.
- Low-income housing.
- A clinic.
- More child-care centers for our children in order to work.
- Low-interest loans to buy a house.
- Recreational Center.
After brainstorming locations to put the recreational center, one woman mentioned the Crussetti plant that is located on Salinas Road. All the women in the group agreed it was an ideal location.

Then a women stated, “Del puente para aca, nos mandan a Monterey” (From the Pajaro River Bridge and back, they send us to Monterey) bringing awareness to the rule of making Pajaro residents commute all the way to the city of Monterey for basic public services when the city of Watsonville is right across the bridge. Then Sister Dolores stated, "We have to unite in order to organize ourselves as women leaders." The conversation then shifted by sharing the number of years the women of the group have lived in Pajaro. The number of years that women in the group lived in Pajaro varied from 1 year to 27 years. The average number of years the rest of the women lived in Pajaro was 12 years. After identifying some of Pajaro’s needs, one women stated, “Cuando no estaba Sister Dolores, no teníamos a nadie (When Sister Dolores was not here, we have no one). Ahora tenemos a la Madre Dolores y tenemos que agarrar su ejemplo, seguir adelante y luchar para sacar a los demás” (Now we have Sister Dolores and we have to follow her example, keep forward, and struggle to lift the rest of us). One woman mentioned that Sister Dolores was “La abogada de nosotros” (The lawyer for us all).

Changing the topic of conversation to the 1995 flood, one woman stated, “Ojala que nunca se inunda el rio para que no venga a mi casa” (I hope that the river never causes a flood so it won’t reach my house). Another women in the group responded to the comment by stating, “No nos queda otra opcion porque no tenemos oportunidades” (We don’t have any other option because we don’t have opportunities). Another woman followed the discussion by stating, “Pero uno se tiene que ocupar. Si se inunda Pajaro, yo tengo que escoger si saco a mis hijos o a mis viejos” (But one does have to worry. If Pajaro floods, I have to choose whether to take out mi children first or my old ones - meaning parents). After exploring some of the factors that led to the flood, one woman stated, “Y por esas salamandras estabamos nadando nosotros” (And because of those salamanders all of us
were swimming). One woman concluded the conversation by stating, “Cada vez que llueve, tengo miedo que salga el rio” (each time it rains, I have a fear that the river will overflow).
XIV. The Need and Importance of Grassroots Social Mobilization in Pajaro and Other Unincorporated Communities

Revealing the many barriers facing Pajaro’s full incorporation as a city and thus, greater autonomy over the representation of its residents, does not reveal the single most important force for positive change in any community. Social change stems from the actions and struggles of people who have identified a need to organize a collective struggle. According to Manuel Castells in his book, The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements, “The city is a social product resulting from conflicting social interests and values” (Castells, p. 291). The issue of conflicting social interests and values is relative to unincorporated areas on a different scale, since one person, the district supervisor, maintains decision making authority over entire community bodies. As Castells also points out, “The political system is aimed at the state, is dependent upon the state, and is part of the state. Therefore, to some extent it institutionalizes some forms of social domination and accepts the rules of bargaining within such forms” (Castells, p. 294). If social control of unincorporated communities stems at the state level, actions must be taken to recognize how social domination plays out in the lives of residents faced with poverty, poor housing opportunities, and lack of services.

Social movements must take shape in order to balance the loss of political power that communities experience due to lack of voting power. It must be through social action that Pajaro residents express their concerns and needs for a healthy community. In a sense, the political status of Pajaro is only one factor limiting its autonomy and opportunity towards building a sustainable community. As Castells states, “Without social movements, no challenge will emerge from civil society able to shake the institution of the state through...
which norms are enforced, values preached, and property preserved” (Castells, p. 294). Pajaro came to historical life when the Monterey County government did not act with an adequate sense of urgency to maintain a Mexican immigrant based community; thus allowing a major flood to damage the lives for thousands of Mexican farm laborers. The probability that an environmental catastrophe such as the 1995 Pajaro flood occurs in the near future is not certain. What is certain is the need for full community participation by Pajaro residents in the form of grassroots organizing.

According to Charles P. Henry’s essay, “Urban Politics and Incorporation: The Case of Blacks, Latinos, and Asians in Three Cities,” “Minorities must be part of a coalition and the coalition must be dominant if the interests of minority groups are to influence policy” (Jennings, p. 17). Pajaro residents are isolated from both mainstream politics and coalition-building with other communities of color. The closest non-Latino community to Pajaro is the city of Marina, a community that is very distant from North Monterey County. Marable also offers another interesting fact regarding the national ratio of people of color at the commencement of the new millennium. Marable states that, “By the year 2000, one-third of the total U.S. population will consist of people of color” (Marable, p. 42). From this perspective, coalition-building must take shape by recognizing as Daniel Osuna states in his essay, “Blacks and Chicanos: Parallels in Political and Historical Struggles,” “reference points of our historical origins and parallels in order to understand and analyze our joint victimization, as well as our joint victories, then we cannot develop the correct solution to oppressions that we all face and must confront” (Jennings, p. 124). Osuna encourages coalition-building between ethnicities as the means of recognizing common struggles. The next step would be to coordinate endeavors geared towards cultural awareness of diverse backgrounds and the recognition of previous struggles of civic justice.

Pajaro residents must come together on a regular basis not only to recognize our civic responsibilities, but also to raise awareness on the issue of discrimination and lack of representation within communities. As David D. Chrislip writes in his book, Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civil Leaders Can Make a Difference, “If you bring the appropriate people together in constructive ways with good information, they will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the shared concerns of the organization or community” (Chrislip p. 14). A successful social movement towards improvement of community not only recognizes positive leaders in the community, but also invites opponents and those certain groups that have traditionally been excluded from expression.

It is not enough to designate advocates to represent the voice of a community. As Chrislip writes, “advocacy oversimplifies and divides, it focuses attention on parochial
interests rather than on the broader good” (Chrislip p. 22). In protest for incorporation or any other solution agreed upon as a collective towards positive social change, I offer potential sources of action that Pajaro residents can take to initiate dialogue.

- Pajaro can plan a peaceful protest by denying the use of services found in Watsonville. By doing so, Pajaro residents, including Monterey County residents, would become aware that the Pajaro’s close proximity to Watsonville blurs their dependent condition and underdeveloped level of self-sustainability.
- Public hearings are crucial to the development of Pajaro as a city or the initiation of social action to address issues of racism, sexism, classism, internalized oppression, ageism, and ableism.
- Constantly organize polls within the Pajaro community identifying resident’s interest in incorporation, annexation, or any other solution that would preserve Pajaro’s demand for community participation and self-sustainability efforts.

It is my impression and my experience living in Pajaro which drives me to believe that unincorporated communities are the labor camps for the 21st century. If democratic participation is to be developed in Pajaro, community leaders must tally the number of all Pajaro residents, the number of migrant laborers, and number of permanent residents who live in the Pajaro community. It is difficult to imagine ways that Monterey County expects to collaborate with Pajaro residents if county officials do not understand the complexity and difficulty of living as a farmworker in a community where she/he is denied a stake in the participation of political and social planning. According to Flores and Benmayor, “Cultural citizenship operates in an uneven field of structural inequalities where the dominant claims of universal citizenship assume a propertyed white male subject and usually blind themselves to their exclusions and marginalization of people who differ in gender, race, sexuality, and age” (Flores et al, p. 37). The socio-economic condition of Pajaro residents, in addition of traditional gender roles that limit women’s liberation, serve to maintain their stigmatized condition of being...
incapable of democratic participation by special interest group needs and their strive for capital gains.

To close my arguments, I present the exploration of forecasted California population size statistics as a continuous reminder to the level of urgency needed for increasing advocacy in rural communities. According to Hans P. Johnson’s essay, “How Many Californians? California Counts: Population Trends and Profiles,” California’s population increase will largely come from natural increases than net migration. A natural increase in population size includes childbirth along with the increase or international migrants into the state who will also nurture families. As Johnson notes, “For 2025, the highest and lowest projections differ by more than 10 million people, with the lowest series projecting a population of 41.5 million and the highest projecting over 52 million” (Johnson, p. 1). Aside from the inconsistent statistical gap, California’s long-term “dynamism,” and the complex natural increase rates between 1st and 2nd generation Latinos indirectly raises awareness to the need for greater autonomy and political decision-making authority for communities and color with or without incorporated status.

As Daniel Osuna writes, “If we don’t start from the reference point of our historical origins and parallels in order to understand and analyze our joint victimization, as well as our joint victories, then we cannot develop the correct solution to oppressions that we all face and must confront” (Osuna, p. 124). The key towards understanding joint victimization is to look at the conditions unincorporated communities face. Doing so will hopefully require the entire Monterey County region to re-prioritize its purpose to serve all residents of the area and investigate the influence of political structures aimed towards sustainability of communities.
XV. Conclusion: CSUMB Service Learning as a Path Towards Political Awareness

In conclusion, I hope this paper supports my belief that Monterey County utilizes unincorporated communities as labor camps for the 21st century. Not only are unincorporated communities exploited by an agricultural industry protected by state power, but they are also stigmatized, stereotyped, and made to believe that their poverty is deserved. Without any protection of boundaries, decision-making ability in local government, and/or lack of opportunities to establish a sense of home, unincorporated communities are subject to capitalistic exploitation of the poor. Our very existence, our surroundings, and our condition as compassionate members of a global community is denied by capitalistic demands for privatization, individualism, commercialism, divisiveness, ignorance, and surplus labor. Our communities are products of this system; it is the system of making money that allows political officials to put profit over people, to use pesticides over organic, to blur history in order to control one’s views of others, to allow sexism to plague our own families, and to prohibit people from realizing their true purposes in life. According to a quote from Peter Mc Laren’s book, *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire, and the Pedagogy of Revolution*:

More than 3 billion human beings on this planet right now live on less that $2 a day. And every day that breaks, 40,000 children-more than one every second!-succumb to diseases linked to chronic hunger. They are there, always there, the terrifying conditions of injustice and inequality that led Che many decades ago to start his journey toward that bullet and that photo awaiting him in Bolivia (McLaren, p. 14). The hunger, exploitation, and despair produced by global capitalism is ignored by White middle and upper class interests who believe that such a consumerist and self-indulgent lifestyle is a human right. When standards of living decrease due to the economic greed of White male upper class capitalists and their global partners, the burden for such a decrease is blamed on exploited communities composed of poor women and men of color, youth, gay and lesbian communities, elders, and the differently-abled.
This paper is deeply shaped by my participation with the Service Learning Institute at California State University, Monterey. It was through a mandated Service Learning requirement and the opportunity to work within the Service Learning Institute that my awareness of social responsibility was nurtured and reinforced. With the support from my fellow University Service Advocates, university students who support service learning courses, community organizations, and the institute, I was able to understand that leadership is based on self-reflection and reciprocal service. Self-reflection allowed me to look back at my two-year living experience in Pajaro and realize that my experience was not unique. My sad and sometimes terrible experience were common for women and youth who live in this unincorporated community. Being given the privilege to attend higher education, understand the service learning philosophy, and participate in service learning courses, taught me about certain mechanisms used against women, people of color, and youth. It also allowed me to realize that oppression is systematized; that our oppressions, depressions, and internalization of hopelessness is generated by political, social, and economic forces. By directly participating in communities, Service Learning allowed me to share a connection with a larger cause and a higher purpose.

A quote from A. Sivanandan in McLaren’s book, a striking similarity is produced with the situation in unincorporated communities:

Education, the staple of diet of Third World countries’ economic and social mobility, has been priced out of the reach of the poor to produce an elite which owes allegiance not to its own people but to opportunities in the West.’ The farmers have no land, the workers have no work, the young have no future, the people have no food. The state belongs to the rich, the rich belong to international capital, the intelligentsia aspire to both. Only religion offers hope; only rebellion, release. Hence the insurrection when it comes is not class but mass, sometimes religious, sometimes secular, often both, but always against the state and its imperial masters (1998/1999, p. 14) (McLaren, p. 25).

Third World atrocities exist in the First World country of the United States; they exist in unincorporated communities comprised mostly of women and men of color, their children, and their elders who are discouraged from establishing a sense of home because they are not permanently wanted; their use is simply to work the fields and go back to Mexico when work is done. I was reassured of this fact by the way that the Pajaro community is designed and served; Literally being served with more alcohol than community centers for educational self-advancement and decent housing. The future of our youth must be secured by whatever means necessary while creating options for women, men, elders, and the differently-abled. At the same time, we must confront the sexism and internalized rage that
affects poor families on a daily basis. The work cannot be done alone, we must build coalitions with unrestrained visions of self-sustaining communities that are dealing with capitalist exploitation, investing in socially responsible businesses, dealing with sexism, racism, and understanding that the state is not necessarily looking out for the best interests. As long as spirituality, life, and love, and anger flow through the veins of oppressed people, systems of oppression will crumble.
## XVI. Appendix A: List of Most Businesses and Type Located in Pajaro, CA

### Agricultural Products:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM Irrigation Specialists Co.</td>
<td>Agricultural products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Auto Shops:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baterías Jose</td>
<td>Car battery shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chez Auto Repair</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Collision &amp; Paint</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercedes Auto Recycling</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Car Care</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno Auto Body</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morimoto's Transmissions</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Auto Center</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Auto Parts</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendería's Tire Service</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Clutches</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville Auto Transmission Clinic</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Auto Service</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Automotive</td>
<td>Auto shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young's Tire Service</td>
<td>Tire products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bakery:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Nopal Bakery</td>
<td>Bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa's Bakery</td>
<td>Bakery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sell alcohol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artichoke Cafe</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Bohemia Club</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatitos Cafe</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pajaro Inn</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chemical and Oil Products:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Gas Products</td>
<td>Chemical facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno Petroleum</td>
<td>Oil lubricants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soilsew</td>
<td>Agricultural chemical products</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Centers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casa de la Cultura</td>
<td>Community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Services International</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grupo Alfa Omega de la Asuncion</td>
<td>Community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lico-Greco Tot Lot Park</td>
<td>Recreational space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County Sheriff Satellite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Library</td>
<td>Community center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Rescue Mission</td>
<td>Homeless shelter for men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Markets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sell alcohol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Express Food Mart</td>
<td>Food market</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Esperanza Market</td>
<td>Food market</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon's Market</td>
<td>Food market</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Liquor Market</td>
<td>Food Market</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico Meat Meat Market</td>
<td>Meat market</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi Ranchito Market</td>
<td>Food market</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pajaro Food Center</td>
<td>Food market</td>
<td>Sell alcohol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gasoline Service:
- Cash Oil: Gasoline facility
- Exxon Gasoline: Gasoline facility
- Quick Stop: Gasoline facility / Sell alcohol

### Miscellaneous:
- Central Coast Livestock Supply: Livestock supply
- Crowley Sales and Export Inc.: ?
- Farmer's Coffee: ?
- Granite Heavy Construction Division: Construction
- Koppe's Plant's: ?
- Lassen Canyon Nursery: ?
- Monterey Bay Fine Hardwoods Co. & J.E. Higgins Lumber Co.: Located in the same facility
- Pajaro Manufacturing and Engineering: ?
- Pajaro Valley Beauty: Haircut and Beauty salon
- Pajaro Video: ?
- Rivera and Son Upholstery: ?
- State Steel Co.: ?
- UAP West: ?
- Val's TV Radio Service: Television appliances
- Yaqui's Tackle: Fishing supplies

### Processing, Packaging, and Cold Storage Plants:
- Americold Logistics: ?
- Berry Fresh Co.: Strawberry packaging facility
- Marinovich Cold Storage: Cold storage
- Smuckers: Processing plant
- Watsonville Berry Cooler: Cold storage and strawberry packaging facility

### Restaurants:
- Joe and Socorro's Restaurant: Restaurant / Sell alcohol
- Real Colima: Restaurant / Sell alcohol

### Used Car Sales:
- Gonzales Auto Sale: Used car shop
- Pajaro Motors Used Cars: Used car shop
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